

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Withdrawn claims 23-44 have been canceled. Entry of the amendment respectfully is requested because the amendment does not raise new issues, cancels withdrawn claims and places the application in tentative condition for allowance based on the in-person interview conducted with the Examiner, as summarized below.

Applicant and Applicant's attorney thank the Examiner for extending the courtesy of an in-person Examiner interview on March 13, 2007. The Examiner Interview Summary Record is of record. During the Examiner Interview, independent claims 1 and 45 were discussed in light of the primary reference, Owen, United States Patent No. 5,248,408 ("the Owens '408 patent"). Based on the arguments presented during the interview, the Examiner agreed that the rejections over the Owen '408 patent would be withdrawn and pending the results of a further search by the Examiner, the application would pass to allowance.

In summary, during the Interview, the Examiner agreed that the claim elements calling for (d) monitoring the temperature of the spent catalyst particles from the stripping zone to determine whether the temperature exceeds a target stripping temperature ranging from about 950°F to about 1075°F and (e) withdrawing a portion of said spent catalyst particles from said stripping zone when the temperature of the spent catalyst particles exceeds the target stripping temperature and directing said spent catalyst

particles to a catalyst cooler distinguish the claimed invention from the Owen '408 patent.

The Owen '408 patent is directed to a different expedient, namely raising, not lowering the temperature of the catalyst in the stripper. To this end, the Owen '408 patent teaches adding hot regenerated catalyst to the stripper in order to heat the catalyst in the stripper to a temperature above the reactor outlet temperature. The stated purpose of this in the Owen '408 patent is to provide improved stripping by stripping at higher temperature to reduce the amount of hydrocarbons on the catalyst, which in turn is alleged to cause a reduction in regenerator temperature (less hydrocarbon to burn), which will in turn prevent catalyst degradation in the regenerator. The fallacy of the Owen '408 patent teaching, however, is that it contemplates such high stripping temperatures that catalyst deactivation will occur in the stripper.

Although in some embodiments of the Owen '408 patent a second stage "stripper/cooler" is added to keep the catalyst from achieving runaway temperatures, there is no mechanism for this "stripper/cooler" of the Owen '408 patent to perform steps (d) and (e) of the present claims. Moreover, the teaching in the Owen '408 patent is a teaching away from the present claimed invention, the basis of which is to lower the catalyst temperature (not raise above the reactor outlet temperature) to prevent catalyst deactivation. Thus, the present invention only calls for the use of the catalyst cooler when the stripping temperature exceeds a temperature of about 1075°F, above which significant catalyst deactivation will occur in the presence of steam in the stripping zone.

Regarding independent claim 16, Applicant notes that the same steps (d) and (e) are recited as steps (i) and (ii), respectively. Regarding independent claim 45, the same steps (d) and (e) appear as steps (e) and (f), respectively. Moreover, as discussed with the Examiner during the interview, this claim further distinguishes over the Owen '408 patent teachings because claim 45 expressly states that the reactor outlet temperature should be above about 1075°F, while the stripper temperature should be from about 950° to about 1075°F. Accordingly, the Owen '408 patent teaching that the stripper temperature must be at least about 25°C (at least about 45°F) higher than the reactor temperature (for example, see col. 20, lines 52-56, col. 9, lines 7-12 and col. 16, lines 62-68), represents a further teaching away from the invention claimed in claim 45.

None of the secondary references have been asserted by the Examiner to provide the teachings missing from the Owen '408 patent, but only were relied on by the Examiner to meet other limitations contained in dependent claims.

Based upon the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-22 and 45 are allowable and that the present claimed invention is in proper form for allowance.

Early and favorable action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'ABC' followed by a stylized flourish.

Alan B. Clement  
Registration No. 34,563

Application No.: 10/633,879  
Art Unit: 1764  
Examiner: John C. Douglas  
Attorney Docket No.: 696-261

MAILING ADDRESS

HEDMAN & COSTIGAN, P.C.  
1185 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, NY 10036  
(212) 302-8989